

REMARKS

Claim 1 was pending in the application and was rejected. Applicant has canceled claim 1 and added new claims 21 through 32. No new matter has been introduced with the addition of the new claims. Support for the new claims can be found in Applicant's disclosure as published in United States Patent Publication No. 2006/0101422, specifically at paragraphs [0017], [0025], [0027], [0035], [0067], [0073], [0076], [0078], and [0083]. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

CLAIM OBJECTION

The Office Action objected to claim 1 because "the copy" in line 7 lacked antecedent basis. Claim 1 has been canceled, thus mooted this objection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been canceled, thus mooted this rejection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over **Multer et al.** (US 6,671,757) in view of **Saulpaugh et al.** (US 7,243,356), and further in view of **Vaha Sipila et al.** (US 2001/0054092). Claim 1 was unnecessarily narrow in its scope. Therefore, Applicant has canceled claim 1 and instead replaced the former claim 1 with new claims 21-28. The issues with regard to claim 1 will be addressed in light of the new claims.

As to independent claim 21 and its dependent claims, Applicant respectfully traverses

the rejection because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 21. In particular, neither **Multer**, **Saulpaugh**, nor **Vaha Sipila** teach or suggest a method call description being generated in a higher level language than the method call. On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner conceded that “Multer failed to teach generating a description of said method call said description being in a higher level language than the method call,” but cites **Saulpaugh** for this teaching.

Saulpaugh does not teach or suggest “generating a description of said method call, said description being in a higher level language than the method call.” Instead, **Saulpaugh** teaches “the use of a method gate to provide a remote method interface between clients and services.” [Saulpaugh, Col. 29, lines 28-29] **Saulpaugh’s** description of the method gate is “an XML message interface to remotely invoke a service method.” [Col. 29, lines 43-44] In **Saulpaugh**, “A service may have a corresponding method gate that implements or is linked to a set of object methods that correspond to the set of method messages defined in the service’s XML schema. There may be a one to one correspondence between the object methods implemented by or linked to the service’s method gate and the method messages defined by the service’s XML schema.” [Saulpaugh, Col. 29, lines 48-54]

Clearly, **Saulpaugh** is describing *both* the content and service method as written in XML. This teaches away from claim 21 which requires that the description of the method call is translated into a higher level language than the method call in order to accommodate another device using a different method call to process the same application. In the instant application at paragraph [0021], we clearly define the description of the method call as the content of the

message: “With regard to the invention, a description of a method call is content of such a message.” Since **Saulpaugh’s** service method and message are *both* in XML, one cannot be presumed to be in a higher level language than the other. See claim 1 of **Saulpaugh**: “the client generating a message in a data representation language, wherein the message includes information representing a computer programming language method call, wherein said generating a message is performed in accordance with a description of the message comprises in the message schema...” **Saulpaugh** makes no mention of differentiating levels of language between the message and the method call.

Further, claim 21 requires “a register device for storing the descriptions of the method calls that could not be transmitted to the second electronic device.” The Examiner cites **Multer** for this teaching, but Applicant must respectfully traverse this rejection. **Multer** does not provide the register as required by claim 21. The Examiner cites **Multer’s** “application object store (AOS) 920” as analogous to the register required by claim 21. **Multer’s** register (the AOS 920) stores the copy of the data. “The generic output of the application object is provided to a delta module 950. Delta module 950 is a differencing engine which calculates differences in data between the output of the application object 910 and the copy of the data which is provided in an application object store (AOS) 920.” [Multer, Col. 12, lines 17-21]

In contrast to **Multer**, the instant application uses the register for storing descriptions of method calls that could not be transmitted. “The device engine uses the local application object store 920 to keep track of the last synchronized version of each application’s actual data, which is then used for the next data comparison by the delta module on the next sync request.”

[Multer, Col. 14, lines 38-42]

For the above reasons, claim 21 is not obvious in view of **Multer**, **Saulpaugh**, and **Vaha Sipila**. **Vaha Sipila** was cited for its teaching of a shared clipboard, but **Vaha Sipila** does not teach or suggest a shared clipboard within the context of the elements of claim 21. Dependent claims 22-27 are patentable over the cited references by virtue of their dependence on claim 21. Claim 29 is a method counterpart to claim 21 and incorporates the same or similar claim language. For this reason, claim 29 and its dependent claims 30-32 are also patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims 21-32. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, including any petition for extension of time fees under §1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Buchenhorner/

Michael J. Buchenhorner
Reg. No. 33,162

Date: November 17, 2009

Michael Buchenhorner, P.A.
8540 S.W. 83 Street
Miami, Florida 33143
(305) 273-8007 (voice)
(305) 595-9579 (fax)